



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/766,336

01/28/2004

Shyh-Mei F. Ho

SVL920030102US1

3271

45112

7590

03/06/2009

Kunzler & McKenzie
8 EAST BROADWAY
SUITE 600
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

ALVESTEFFER, STEPHEN D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2175

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/06/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/766,336 | Applicant(s) HO ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Stephen Alvesteffer | Art Unit 2175 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Stephen Alvesteffer, examiner of record. (3) David J. McKenzie, Reg.#46,919, for applicant.

(2) William Bashore, supervisory patent examiner. (4) Alec J. McGinn, for applicant.

Date of Interview: 24 February 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 29.

Identification of prior art discussed: Bach et al. (US 5,781,739), Bach et al. (US 6,141,660), and Francis et al. (US 6,665,861).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representatives described the invention and how proposed amendments are believed to distinguish over the cited prior art of record. Upon cursory review, the proposed amendments appear to overcome the cited prior art of record. Further search and consideration will be made upon receipt of an official response.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

| | |
|--|--|
| | /William L. Bashore/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175 |
|--|--|